American Free Press
Correspondent

Zionist Influence on the American Media:

Its Impact on Media Coverage of the Middle East; The Untold Story Behind The JFK Assassination, Watergate and the Lewinsky Scandal

By Michael Collins Piper

March 10, 2003

What follows is the text of *American Free Press* correspondent Michael Collins Piper's presentation, on March 10, 2003, before the Zayed Center for Coordination and Follow-Up in Abu Dhabi in the United Arab Emirates. At that time, the Zayed Center was the officially-designed think tank of the Arab League. A major controversy erupted as a consequence of Piper's presentation (details of which appear after the text of the presentation):

I would like to thank His Highness Sheikh Zayed Bin Sultan Al Nahyan, the Arab League, the Zayed Centre and its staff, and all of those gathered here for honoring me with this opportunity to speak to you today.

My topic — the reason for the failure of the U.S. media to accurately portray the conflict between Israel and the Palestinian people and the resulting impact on U.S. Middle East policy — is certainly a timely one, more so than ever.

However, I would note this: The policies toward Israel and the Arab world being pursued by those who control the United States government today are not policies that would be endorsed by the American people if the American people had a full understanding of the history of the Middle East during the past century.

And this speaks directly to the question of media bias. It is precisely because of this media bias that Americans have failed, for so long, to understand the improper nature of the policies being pursued by their government.

The American mass media tells Americans, time and again, that in totalitarian states the governments control the media. Americans are told that this is wrong.

However, what Americans are NOT told is that in the United States today, the small group of tightly-knit families and financial interests who dominate the major media use that power to control the government and its policies.

Americans view television news as some form of entitlement — a public utility, much like water or electricity. The average American has no idea that the media is actually a tool for those who control it to use for the exercise of political power. Americans are good people, really, but are in many respects, very, very naïve.

I am here to tell you — very proudly — that for the last 23 years, more than half my life, I have been one of the few independent-minded American journalists who have attempted to provide balance and truth in reporting on the Middle East conflict. In fact, it was precisely because of this concern I entered into journalism in the first place: to combat the anti-Arab and anti-Muslim bias on the part of the media in America.

It hasn't been easy, needless to say, but it has been satisfying for I know that I have been on the side of truth and justice. Frankly, very few journalists in America can say that.

For many years, my good friend, Dr. Issa Nakhleh — the longtime representative in New York at the United Nations for the Arab Higher Committee for Palestine — sought to drive home to Americans a very simple thesis: "The Arabs are your friends. The Zionists are making them your enemies."

So with that in mind, I am also here to bring you some good news: although the Zionist influence over the American media—and over American government policy making—is certainly greater than at any time in history, thanks to the expansion of the Internet and other independent media, the numbers of independent journalists in America who are now daring to speak out are growing by leaps and bounds.

And, as a direct consequence, more and more Americans — really, by the millions — are beginning to understand that there is more than one side to the story of the Middle East conflict and that the very cause of the ongoing crisis with Iraq — not to mention the tragic events of September 11, 2001, whomever may be responsible — is the ill-founded U.S. bias against the Arab (and Muslim) worlds.

So while, in some respects, I was very much a pioneer in the field of honest, accurate reporting about the Middle East — working alongside a relative handful of other like-minded Americans — I can say with satisfaction: I was ahead of my time. And now others are finally catching up.

All of that having been said, Let me begin the formal part of my presentation by a very simple example that illustrates the pro-Israel bias on the part of the American media.

Did you know that on October 18, 1983 a suicide bomber — strapped with explosives and threatening to blow up the U.S. Capitol — was captured by police in the crowded spectators' gallery of the House of Representatives in the U.S. Capitol in Washington, DC?

If none of you assembled here today were aware of this incident, I would not be surprised — if only for the simple reason that most Americans themselves are — to this day — unaware of this very real threat against the U.S. Capitol and members of the U.S. Congress.

The truth is that this terrorist threat hardly made the news at all.

The reason, I contend, that this particular event — a would-be suicide bombing — did not reach a broad-ranging national and international audience is for one reason and one reason alone:

The individual who attempted this suicide bombing was an Israeli Jew — 22 year old Israel Rabinowits.

To the best of my knowledge, this remarkable event was mentioned just once in *The Washington Post* — the so-called newspaper of record in the American capital — and only once, in passing, in *The New York Times*.

And for the record, even though it was certainly qualified as "big" news, even *The Washington Post* buried the story in its local news section — across from the obituaries.

Evidently an attempt to by a suicide bomber to destroy the U.S. Capitol wasn't worthy of the front page in 1983.

Today, in fact, if you bother to check on the Internet you won't find even a mention of this event.

Wayne Todd, editor of the *National Legislative Service & Security Association* noted in the Nov. 1983 issue of his report that the story about the Israeli's attempt to bomb the Capitol was "virtually ignored by the media."

Imagine — dare I say it — if the suicide bomber had been a Palestinian Arab. The story would have been on the front page of every newspaper in America. Every major network and newsmagazine would have devoted additional time and space to the topic of "Arab terrorism." The Israeli lobby would have a field day. By this time there would have been a Hollywood film about the event. The officer who caught the would-be terrorist would have been on the cover of People magazine.

But the would-be terrorist was not an Arab. He was an Israeli. And therefore, the story disappeared into the classic Memory Hole.

Now this has been just a simple example of media bias, but it illustrates my point all too clearly.

And before anyone might suggest that accusations of media bias in favor of Israel are somehow rooted in so-called "rumors from the Muslim world" or the work of "Arab propagandists," please allow me to note this:

While Americans didn't read about it in their daily newspaper or hear Dan Rather talking about it on CBS, on June 1, 2002 *Civilta Cattolica*—an influential Jesuit journal sanctioned by the Vatican — actually fired a volley at the American media for its obsessive coverage of the ongoing Catholic Church sex scandals.

What is significant, for our context here, is that in tracing the media's interest in the church's troubles, the Vatican hinted at the behind-the-scenes power of the inter-connected handful of powerful pro-Israel families and financial interests who dominate the media monopoly in shaping the media's news coverage.

The Vatican-approved article flatly asserted that — at least in part because the Catholic Church refused to support the Persian Gulf War against Saddam Hussein in 1991 — the controllers of the American media monopoly had nursed a grudge against the church.

And while the Vatican didn't say it directly, it is absolutely beyond question that it was the pro-Israel lobby that was the prime mover behind the war against Saddam — then, as today.

Given that — as the record indicates — the media's sudden and intense interest in the church's problems did, in fact, evolve after Sept. 11, it is interesting to note that *Civilta Cattolica* also cited the aftermath of 9-11 in its dissection of the media's attacks on the church:

The journal suggested that the Catholic Church's appeals against "vendettas" against the Arab and Muslim world in the wake of 9-11 also offended the media, which has been heavily promoting an anti-Arab and anti-Muslim agenda.

Now while no one excuses either the Vatican or other church officials for misfeasance, malfeasance or non-feasance in handling the travesty of sexual abuse by priests, the truth is that the problem has been one of long-standing and has really been no secret whatsoever.

It was only after Sept. 11 — as any content analysis of daily news coverage will affirm — that the American media began devoting so much space to the problem.

It is no exaggeration to conclude that much as the media has almost made the terms "Muslim" or "Arab" virtually synonymous with the word "terrorist," the term "Catholic" is now almost synonymous with the term "pedophile

In fact, the Vatican's criticism of the media giants is not a new development. Several years ago, speaking before Corallo — the consortium of independent local radio and television channels in Italy, Pope John Paul II cited the rise of global media monopolies and emphasized the need for "local information" — that is, media voices outside the hands of the powerful media barons.

The Pope said that "communication has become the soul which shapes the culture of our time" and stressed what he called the "dignity" of independent media.And it is the independent media — of which I have been a part for my entire career — that has provided an alternative to the pro-Israel propaganda and disinformation that has so permeated the self-styled "mainstream" media in America today.

What then, is the source of the problem? Why is the media so skewed in favor of Israel?

In 1937, American muckraker Ferdinand Lundberg created a stir with a book entitled *America's Sixty Families*. His book was the first comprehensive look at the rising accumulation of vast wealth and influence by a small group of Americans — many of them inter-married families or otherwise connected through business relationships — who had come to dominate the American republic.

Lundberg opened that volume by making an assertion that — while quite true — opened the eyes of the American reading public to a reality that perhaps few had recognized:

> "The United States is owned and dominated today by a hierarchy of its sixty richest families, buttressed by no more than ninety families of lesser wealth.
>
> "This de facto government is actually the government of the United States — informal, invisible, shadowy. It is the government of money in a dollar democracy.
>
> "Under their acquisitive fingers, and in their possession, the sixty families hold the richest nation ever fashioned in the workshop of history . . . ."

At the time Lundberg was writing, there was a solid core of substantial Jewish wealth among the "Sixty Families" listed. Times did change, however, and Jewish wealth and influence was on the ascendancy. However, except in limited circles, the discussion of Jewish wealth and power remained largely a topic very much unspoken.

In this context, about the media, Lundberg noted: "The journalism of the United States, from top to bottom, is the personal affair — bought and paid for — of the wealthy families. There is little in American journalism today, good or bad, which does not emanate from the family dynasties." Lundberg called this phenomenon "the press of the plutocracy" and what he wrote about in 1937 continues to exist today — but more so.

In 1968 Lundberg came back with a sequel to *America's Sixty Families*. This new volume, *The Rich and the Super-Rich*, was an overview of the then-existing state of affairs in the secret world of the super-rich in America. In that second book, Lundberg made the rather interesting assessment of the situation, concluding that, in his choice words: "a relative handful of Americans are extravagantly endowed, like princes in the Arabian Nights tales."

Although Lundberg was quite right in his overall assessment about the accumulation of wealth and media power in a few hands, he fell down on one key point: Today's elite in America: Princes they are — but they are not Arabian.

While the major media tells Americans about the wealth of the Arab sheikhs and of the oil riches of the Middle East, Americans have no idea that the accumulated wealth of the American Jewish community — and the political influence that comes with it in every major city (and certainly in small cities and towns across America) — dwarfs that of those Arabian princes that so concerned this Jewish-American author.

America's "New Elite" today are unquestionably the wealthy and powerful Jewish families who—unlike the Rockefellers, the Morgans, the Roosevelts, the Kennedys, the Vanderbilts and the other "princes" of previous eras—have a considerably lower public profile than the non-Jewish American elite of the past.

American Jews are indeed the modern-day equivalents of the princes in the tales of the Arabian Nights.

And while the Jewish elite may not constitute a majority, per se, of the billionaires or the super-rich on the famous "Forbes 400," list, their combined wealth certainly rivals (most likely surpasses) that of the non-Jewish elite.

As such, the Jewish elite have used their wealth to amass a great deal of media control — and that is putting it lightly.

Pro-Israel Jewish families and/or financial interests control all three of the major news magazines: *Time*, *Newsweek*, and *U.S. News & World Report*, not to mention both major national daily newspapers — *The Washington Post* and *The New York Times*. [And since the time that I spoke those words at the Zayed Center, even *The Chicago Tribune* and *The Los Angeles Times* now bear the distinction of being Jewish-controlled, both publications previously known as bastions of "WASP" publishing power in America — MCP.]

Even in the field of tabloid journalism — although most Americans don't know it — every single one of the sensational super-market tabloids is owned by one media outlet, a tightly-controlled corporation organized by an influential American Zionist figure, former Deputy Treasury Secretary Roger Altman.

In addition, every one of the major television networks is dominated by Jewish financial interests.

These media voices shape the American perception of the Middle East conflict. And aside from the high-level control of the networks, the newspapers and the newsmagazines, there remains the significant Jewish presence within the editorial and news staffs of these media outlets. In that regard, I will refer, exclusively, to the comments made by American Jewish writers who have touched on the subject.

Jewish-American writer Joel Kotkin, in his book, *Tribes*, asserts:

> "Although not in control of the media and the arts, as some anti-Semites suggest, Jews clearly possess a disproportionate influence in movies, publishing, advertising and theater. In the media, according to one survey in the 1970s, one quarter of the leading figures were Jewish, more than ten times their percentage in the general population."

J. J. Goldberg, writing in his book, *Jewish Power: Inside the American Jewish Establishment*, declared:

> "It is true that Jews are represented in the media business in numbers far out of proportion to their share of the population.
>
> "Studies have shown that while Jews make up little more than 5 percent of the working press nationwide — hardly more than their share of the population — they make up one fourth or more of the writers, editors, and producers in America's 'elite media,' including network news divisions, the top newsweeklies and the four leading daily papers (*New York Times*, *Los Angeles Times*, *Washington Post*, *Wall Street Journal*).
>
> "In the fast-evolving world of media megacorporations, Jews are even more numerous.
>
> "In an October 1994 *Vanity Fair* feature profiling the kingpins of the new media elite, titled 'The New Establishment,' just under half of the two dozen entrepreneurs profiled were Jews.
>
> "In the view of the magazines editors, these are America's true power elite, "men and women from the entertainment, communications and computer industries, whose ambitions and influence have made America the one true superpower of the Information Age."

Goldberg cites Eugene Fisher, the director of Catholic-Jewish relations for the National Conference of Catholic Bishops. Mr. Fisher has commented:

> "If there is Jewish power, it's the power of the word, the power of Jewish columnists and Jewish opinion makers. The Jewish community is a very literate community, and it has a lot to say. And if you can shape opinion, you can shape events."

Goldberg adds, referring to the Jewish predominance in the Hollywood film industry:

> "Hollywood at the end of the twentieth century is still an industry with a pronounced ethnic tinge. Virtually all the senior executives at the major studios are Jews.
>
> "Writers, producers, and to a lesser degree directors are disproportionately Jewish—one recent study showed the figure as high as 59 percent among top-grossing films.
>
> "The combined weight of so many Jews in one of America's most lucrative and important industries gives the Jews of Hollywood a great deal of political power."

Pointing out, in the mid-1980s, that "Jews play an increasingly important role in journalism, " Charles Silberman noted that:

> "In 1982, for example, Jews made up a little less than 6 percent of the national press corps as a whole but 25 to 30 percent of the "media elite"—those working for *The New York Times*,*The Washington Post*, and *The Wall Street Journal*; for *Time*, *Newsweek*, and *U.S. News & World Report*; and for the news divisions of CBS, NBC, ABC, and the Public Broadcasting System and its leading stations. (A 1971 study put the number of Jews in the media elite at 25 percent.) When one looks at the key decision-making positions, the Jewish role appears to be even larger."

Silberman adds:

> "Jews are equally influential, if less well known, in the management of television news. It is the network correspondents, of course, who have become household names, among them Jews . . .
>
> "The greatest concentration of Jews, however, is at the producer level — and it is the producers who decide which stories will go on the air, and how long, and in what order they will run.
>
> "In 1982, before a shift in assignments, the executive producers of all three evening newscasts were Jewish, as were the executive producers of CBS's '60 Minutes' and ABC's '20/20.'And Jews are almost equally prominent at the 'senior producer' and 'broadcast producer' levels as well as in senior management."

In his 1995 book, *Assimilation and Its Discontents*, Jewish author Barry Rubin also emphasizes how Jewish concerns permeate American popular culture in the print media. He pointed out how, for example, on just one single day — Oct. 18, 1992 — the reviews section of *The Washington Post*:

"[Was] full of books by or about Jews: on sports and the American Jewish experience; a biography of Bill Graham, a Holocaust survivor and leading rock & roll impresario; the story of an upper-class New York family infected by antisemitism; a South African woman's group portrait of her set of Jewish friends; a Jewish couple's volume on foreign investments in America, analyzing problems of multiple loyalties and foreign influence parallel issues in assimilation; and a Jewish author's book on politics in higher education, discussing multiculturalism in terms drawn from the integration of Jews into American society."

Forgive me if I have belabored an all-too obvious point. There is a very strong Jewish presence in the media. That presence bends the American media in a bias in favor of Israel and against the Arab world.

Professor Ben Bagdikian, a prominent media critic and author of the book, *The Media Monopoly*, has pointed out the dangers of a select few controlling the mass media:

> "The [media] lords of the global village have their own political agenda. All resist economic changes that do not support their own financial interests. Together, they exert a homogenizing power over ideas, culture and commerce that affects populations larger than any in history.
>
> "Neither Caesar nor Hitler, Franklin Roosevelt nor any Pope, has commanded as much power to shape the information on which so many people depend to make decisions about everything from whom to vote for to what to eat . . .
>
> "Monopolistic power dominates many other industries and most of them enjoy special treatment by the government.
>
> "But media giants have two enormous advantages:
>
> "They control the public image of national leaders who, as a result, fear and favor the media magnates' political agendas; and
>
> "They control the information and entertainment that help establish the social, political and cultural attitudes of increasingly larger populations . . .
>
> "In 1989, there were 11 major media giants emerging as the most powerful names in the global media monopoly. Since that time, those numbers have deceased even as the various media holdings of the smaller number of media monopolies have increased".

The comments of Bagdikian regarding the growing concentration of media ownership summarize the matter well:

> "When 50 men and women, chiefs of their corporations, control more than half the information and ideas that reach 249 million Americans, it is time for Americans to examine the institutions from which they receive their daily picture of the world.
>
> "Theirs is a strategy of total control. They buy every possible means of delivery (print, broadcast, films, etc). They strive to use their own rather than independently produced material. Then they convert it to as many forms of media as they control. Even the world's scholarly, scientific and technical journals are now largely controlled by the big media barons . . ."

Based upon all of this, it is absolutely precise and fair to say that — largely because of its influence over the media, not to mention the vast accumulation of wealth and power in other realms — Zionist Power in America Today Is Greater Than in Any Country at any Time in Recorded History . . .

Jewish-American Professor Norman Cantor has encapsulated this immense power. In his controversial book, *The Sacred Chain*, widely criticized for its candor, Cantor wrote of Jewish power and affluence in America today:

> "Nothing in Jewish history equaled this degree of Jewish accession to power, wealth and prominence. Not in Muslim Spain, not in early 20th century Germany, not in Israel itself, because there were no comparable levels of wealth and power on a world-class scale in that small country to attain."

According to Cantor: "The Morgans, the Rockefellers, the Harrimans, the Roosevelts, the Kennedys, the titans of bygone eras, they have been superseded by [the Jew] as flawless achiever . . . ."

So the media itself is largely dominated and substantially influenced from within by pro-Israel forces.

What happens in America when some independent journalist, some maverick political figure, or even a newspaper reporter devoted to the truth dares suggest something unpleasant about Israel?

It is then that a powerful force all its own swings into action. This organization is known as the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith — or, "the ADL" for short.

The ADL, as many of you probably know, maintains close ties to Israel's Mossad and functions as an information gathering outlet for the Mossad.

The ADL also functions as a very aggressive public relations agency on behalf of Israel and against any and all critics of Israel.

Of particular interest is the ADL's use of undercover operatives to infiltrate and spy upon critics of U.S. favoritism toward Israel. The ADL maintains massive spy files on critics of Israel and doesn't hesitate to use those files in the most pernicious ways possible.

In late 1992, a major scandal erupted in San Francisco, California when — for reasons which remain murky to this day — both the FBI and the San Francisco Police Department raided the office of the ADL as well as the home of its top undercover operative, one Roy Bullock. The ADL was being investigated for illegal domestic spying and also the unauthorized use of police intelligence files.

I am proud to say that some seven years before Mr. Bullock was officially exposed as an ADL spy, I was the first journalist in America to expose Bullock as an ADL undercover operative, although, at the time, Bullock vehemently denied the charges.

I am also proud to say that when the FBI formally unmasked Bullock, the ADL said under questioning by the FBI that it was my expose of Bullock as an ADL undercover operative that set in motion the chain of events that ultimately led to the FBI-police raid on ADL headquarters in both San Francisco and Los Angeles.

The case proceeded so far that it was reported that the authorities were planning to seek criminal indictments of top ADL officials. The case was only dropped after pressure on the San Francisco District Attorney's office by the Jewish community.

And I should note this: During the ADL scandal, *The San Francisco Weekly*, a small progressive, alternative weekly, reported something that had never before been reported and which will be of particular interest to our audience here today:

This is the fact that, according to a former ADL employee in Manhattan, during the 1960's, prior to his assassination, the late Dr. Martin Luther King was viewed as a "loose cannon" by the ADL and was the target of its spying operations. In fact, the ADL turned the fruits of its "fact finding" over to J. Edgar Hoover of the FBI.

Suffice it to say that there have been reports (from sources close to Dr. King and his family) that prior to his assassination Dr. King was moving toward taking a public stand that Zionism is a form of racism.

In that regard — without pursuing the matter any further than this, I will tell you that Dr. King's alleged assassin, James Earl Ray — whose bid for exoneration was supported by King's own family, said early on that he believed that Israel's Mossad was behind Dr. King's assassination. And that, of course, is not something the American media ever reported.

In any case, despite such revelations, the ADL remains very much a part of the Zionist power bloc in America and the American media eagerly reports anything — repeat ANYTHING — that the ADL asserts without question.

The ADL (a unit of the Mossad) is a virtual adjunct of the pro-Israel media force in America today. You cannot discuss the American media bias in favor of Israel without discussing the role of the ADL.

In fact, since the Sept. 11 attacks, as you well know, the major media in the United States — particularly the broadcast media — has waged a continuing propaganda campaign against the Arab world, and Saudi Arabia in particular.

Hardly a week has gone by that there haven't been commentaries or questions raised along the line: "Are the Saudis really our friends?" — Or more, directly, it is often stated: "The Saudis are really not our friends. They are our enemies."

The media continues to put forth what is actually the Israeli opinion and propaganda line (disguised as "news") regarding Saudi Arabia.

The media campaign against the Saudis has been so intense that even the courtly and urbane Prince Bandar, the otherwise soft-spoken longtime Saudi ambassador to the United States, recently and correctly described much of the anti-Saudi propaganda by using a choice word that refers to barnyard droppings.

Although the overwhelming majority of the television audience and newspaper readers don't know it, many of the attacks on Saudi Arabia in the major media come practically verbatim from a 49-page "white paper" issued by the Anti-Defamation League (ADL), a key public relations arm for the Israeli lobby.

Hidden behind the deliberately ambiguous and indifferent title *The U.S.-Saudi Relationship*, the ADL has circulated perhaps tens of thousands of copies of this propaganda screed to newspaper editors and reporters throughout the United States over the past twenty years.

In doing so, the ADL discreetly suggests that the document be used by editors and reporters as "background" in preparation of stories relating to Saudi Arabia.

Finding a handy "capsule" document at their disposal, reporters — who generally have no particular axe to grind one way or the other, or who otherwise know it is in their best interests to promote the Israeli propaganda line — quote the document freely and regularly, never revealing the ADL as the source.

Now, because of the pro-Israel bias within the media as a whole, coupled with the additional pressure from the outside, the work of such groups as the ADL, the media's failure to address all aspects of the Middle East question has had a significant impact in a very broad historical sense.

The secret Israeli connection to at least several major political events in recent American history — often the real key to understanding these events — has been deliberately suppressed or ignored by the mass media in America.

What I am about to say will be controversial. But I will say it.

The three most talked-about and most serious political convulsions that rocked the American system of government during the last half of the 20th century century can all be traced most directly and definitively to the continuing conflict over Palestine and the aggressive imperial role of Israel in Middle East affairs. I refer, of course, to:

- The assassination of John F. Kennedy,
- The Watergate scandal and the toppling of President Richard M. Nixon, and
- The Monica Lewinsky affair and the impeachment trial of President Bill Clinton.

And, needless to say, despite all the media uproar over each of these crises, the Middle East connection — that is, the Israeli connection — has gone unreported, except in independent media, such as, for example, my own newspaper, *American Free Press*.

Unfortunately, of course, I don't have the time to go into all of the details here, but I would like to attempt a brief overview.

Regarding the Kennedy Assassination — a topic of special interest to me, as you will see.

In 1992, former U.S. Congressman Paul Findley made the little-noticed but intriguing comment that "in all the words written about the assassination of John F. Kennedy, Israel's intelligence agency, the Mossad, has never been mentioned, despite the obvious fact Mossad complicity is as plausible as any of the other theories."

What Findley did not know was that, at that very moment, I was in the process of assembling a book, to be titled *Final Judgment*, which did indeed contend (and document) that the Mossad role alongside certain Mossad-allied elements inside the America CIA was the big secret — the "missing link"—that explained the entirety of the JFK assassination conspiracy.

Although my book *Final Judgment* has never been in any major bookstore, some 30,000 copies are in circulation — more copies than more widely-publicized books on the topic. It is truly an "underground best-seller." And I'm pleased to say that an Arabic-language translation has been published by the distinguished firm of Dar El Ilm Lilmalayin, based in Beirut. [As of 2013, some 50,000 copies of the book are circulating. See michaelcollinspiper.com for the ebook edition.]

Final Judgment documents that in 1963 JFK was embroiled in a bitter secret conflict with Israeli leader David Ben-Gurion over Israel's drive to build the atomic bomb; that Ben-Gurion resigned in disgust, saying that because of JFK's policies, Israel's "existence [was] in danger." Then upon JFK's assassination, U.S. policy toward Israel began an immediate 180-degree turnaround.

Israeli historian Avner Cohen's new book, *Israel and the Bomb*, confirms the conflict between JFK and Israel so powerfully that, Israel's *Ha'aretz*, declared Cohen's book a "bombshell" saying its revelations would "necessitate the rewriting of Israel's entire history."

Ethan Bronner, reviewing Cohen's book in *The New York Times*, called Israel's drive to build a nuclear bomb "a fiercely hidden subject," and indeed, at the time of the JFK assassination, it was.

And this, of course, explains why JFK researchers never considered an Israeli connection until my book, *Final Judgment*, supplied the missing pieces, assembling what I have called "the hidden picture on the other side of the jigsaw puzzle."

Although the American media has promoted a wide-ranging and often confusing variety of theories blaming various power interests for the JFK assassination, the very real Israeli connection was never once mentioned.

The *Ha'aretz* review of the book by Avner Cohen is quite interesting. It reads in part:

"The murder of American President John F. Kennedy brought to an abrupt end the massive pressure being applied by the U.S. administration on the government of Israel to discontinue the nuclear program.

"Cohen demonstrates at length the pressures applied by Kennedy on Ben-Gurion. He brings the fascinating exchange of letters between the two, in which Kennedy makes it quite clear to the Israeli prime minister that he will under no circumstances agree to Israel becoming a nuclear state.

"The book implied that, had Kennedy remained alive, it is doubtful whether Israel would today have a nuclear option."

I couldn't put it better myself.

According to historian Stephen Green:

"Perhaps the most significant development of 1963 for the Israeli nuclear weapons program, however, occurred on November 22 on a plane flying from Dallas to Washington, D.C., Lyndon Baines Johnson was sworn in as the 36th President of the United States, following the assassination of John F. Kennedy."

And as Green summarized it: "In the early years of the Johnson administration the Israeli nuclear weapons program was referred to in Washington as 'the delicate topic.' Lyndon Johnson's White House saw no Dimona, heard no Dimona, and spoke no Dimona when the reactor went critical in early 1964."

Thus it was that the critical point of dispute between John F. Kennedy and the Mossad-dominated government of Israel was no longer an issue. The new American president, Lyndon Johnson — so long a partisan of Israel — allowed the nuclear development to continue. This was just the beginning.

Now while all of this presents a strong motive for Israel to strike against JFK, my book *Final Judgment* also documents what even maverick Israeli journalist Barry Chamish has admitted is "a pretty cogent case" for Mossad collaboration in the assassination conspiracy.

The fact is that when New Orleans District Attorney Jim Garrison prosecuted trade executive Clay Shaw with conspiracy in the assassination, Garrison had stumbled upon the Mossad link.

Although (after his acquittal) Shaw was revealed to have been a CIA asset, in 1963 also Shaw served on the board of a Rome-based company, Permindex, which was actually a front for a Mossad-sponsored arms procurement operation.

A primary shareholder in Permindex, the Banque De Credit Internationale of Geneva, was not only the fiefdom of Tibor Rosenbaum, a high-level Mossad official, but also the chief money laundry for Meyer Lansky, "chairman" of the American organized crime syndicate and long-time Israeli loyalist.

The chief executive of Permindex was Louis Bloomfield of Montreal, a top figure in the Israeli lobby and an operative of the Bronfman family, intimate Lansky associates and leading patrons of Israel.

Permindex was clearly the Israeli link to the JFK assassination, so much so that Jim Garrison later circulated the manuscript for a never-published novel in which he fingered the Mossad as prime mover behind the conspiracy.

The Permindex link also explains the often-discussed "French connection" to the JFK assassination.

However, only my book, *Final Judgment*, has explained precisely what the French connection really was:

That is, that Permindex was also involved in assassination attempts against French President Charles DeGaulle by the French "Secret Army Organization" (OAS) which itself had close ties to the Mossad.

Like the OAS, the Israelis hated DeGaulle not only because he gave independence to Algeria, a major new Arab state, but also because DeGaulle, who had assisted Israel, had withdrawn support, objecting (as did JFK) to Israel's drive for an atomic arsenal.

A French intelligence officer revealed to me that the Mossad contracted out one of JFK's assassins — probably a Corsican hitman — through a French intelligence official who was disloyal to DeGaulle and who hated JFK for supporting Algerian independence.

JFK was also planning a strike against Red China's nuclear bomb program — a plan scuttled by Lyndon Johnson within a month of JFK's assassination. During this same period, in fact, Israel and Red China were involved in joint secret nuclear bomb research with a key player in the Permindex web, Shaul Eisenberg, serving as the Mossad's liaison with China.

And again, I should note: the American media has been loathe to mention the fact that Israel and Red China's nuclear arms collaboration goes back to the early 1960s — another big secret kept from the American people.

My book *Final Judgment* was first to point out that James Angleton, the CIA liaison to the Mossad, was a devoted partisan of Israel who not only orchestrated the scenario linking accused assassin Lee Oswald to the Soviet KGB but who later circulated disinformation to confuse investigations into the assassination.

I would submit to you here today that Hollywood's Oliver Stone failed to mention these details in his famous film *JFK* because that film was financed by Arnon Milchan, an Israeli arms dealer linked to smuggling of materiel to Israel's nuclear program — the point of contention between JFK and Israel.

Although Israeli diplomat Uri Palti called the thesis of my book "nonsense," and pro-Israel columnist George Will declared it "vicious intellectual licentiousness," *The Los Angeles Times* grudgingly admitted that *Final Judgment* was "novel indeed," saying it "weave[s] together some of the key threads in a tapestry that many say is unique."

The very week in 1997 the American Library Association sponsored "Banned Books Week," the aforementioned Anti-Defamation League (the ADL) created an uproar, forcing cancellation of a college seminar on the JFK assassination because I had been invited to speak.

The ADL feared "impressionable" students might take my thesis seriously. That same ADL feels that American college students are quite prepared, on the other hand, to fight and die for Israel.

The very strength of my book, according to many readers who are familiar with other data on the JFK assassination, is that it shows how all of the more familiar theories about the assassination are connected — and that connection is indeed the Israeli connection.

To this day, eight years after the release of the book:

- No one has been able to rebut the thesis, misquoted any of my sources or quoted any of my sources out of context.
- No one has been able to demonstrate where any of the key points in my thesis are refuted by other information.
- No one has cited any specific errors (relevant to the thesis) that would contradict my thesis.

Considering the energetic and very public efforts of the ADL to defame this book, one would think that the ADL would assemble a crack team of researchers to tear the book apart. And bear in mind that if the book were so much nonsense, the ADL would not pay *Final Judgment* the attention that they do.

In light of Israel's unhindered production of weapons of mass destruction — and the apparent role of Israel's Mossad in the assassination of the one president who tried to stop it, I would ask those assembled here to give the Arabic edition of my book the widest distribution and firmest endorsement possible.

The world does need to know who really killed John F. Kennedy and why. The evidence demonstrates that there is a very strong foundation for my thesis. It is a scenario that does make sense, much to the dismay of my critics. *Final Judgment* encapsulates a thesis that they can't discredit. The genie is out of the bottle and neither *Final Judgment* nor its thesis are about to go away.

So much for the JFK assassination.

What about the media-orchestrated assassination of Richard M. Nixon — remembered today as Watergate? Again, we find an Israeli connection but one that the major media prefers to keep under wraps.

In March of 1974 President Nixon sent General Vernon Walters, who was then deputy director of the CIA, as his special representative for a secret meeting with two PLO leaders, Khalad Hassan and Majed Abu Sharar, who represented, respectively the so-called "right" and "left" wings of Fatah, the largest and most influential of the Palestinian factions that made up the PLO.

Although the meeting evidently ended with great promise of working out a comprehensive Middle East settlement, British journalist Alan Hart reports that not long afterward, Henry Kissinger sabotaged that back-channel effort by President Nixon to achieve peace.

Although the details are spelled out clearly in Hart's biography of Yasser Arafat, few Americans know — although they should know — that Chairman Arafat and the two Hassan brothers told Hart, in Hart's words, "that they were convinced that the government of Israel and the Jewish lobby in America had made use of the Watergate affair to break Nixon before he forced Israel to make the necessary withdrawals for peace."

Khalad Hassan also told Hart that he (Hassan) had discussed Nixon's continuing back-channel peace initiatives with then-King Feisal of Saudi Arabia who had played a part in the effort. Evidently, according to Hart' rendition, President Nixon himself told King Feisal this:

"If [Nixon] found his way blocked by Israel and the Jewish lobby, he would throw away his prepared text when he made his next State of the Union report [in January of 1975] and that he would tell the people of America, live on TV and radio, the whole truth about how Israel and its friends in America were the obstacle to peace."

In other words, Nixon was preparing to expose the way in which the Government of Israel and its supporters in America controlled American foreign policy.

President Nixon never had the opportunity to make such a bold move. The media focus on the burgeoning Watergate scandal drove him from office. Thanks to an inside source today remembered as "Deep Throat," The Washington Post led the the drumbeat for Nixon's removal from office.

In that regard it is interesting to note that former American diplomat Richard Curtiss, executive editor of *The Washington Report on Middle East Affairs*, stated frankly in 1995 that "it's long been our opinion that whoever played the role of 'Deep Throat' was in fact only a conduit for information collected by Israel's Mossad and used to discredit Nixon," and that Nixon's attempt to reassess U.S. relations with Israel was "the catalyst that led directly to his downfall.."

There is, in fact, evidence that the enigmatic source "Deep Throat" was, at the least, an indirect operative of Israel's Mossad. In her book, *Katharine the Great*, a critical biography of Katharine Graham, the late publisher of *The Washington Post*, Jewish-American journalist Debra Davis has almost certainly provided the real key to Watergate.

Miss Davis presents a solid case that the *Post's* famed Watergate source — "Deep Throat" — was most likely Richard Ober, the right-hand man of James Angleton, the CIA's counterintelligence chief and longtime and Israeli-allied liaison to the Mossad.

Miss Davis revealed that Ober was in charge of a joint CIA-Israeli counterintelligence desk established by Angleton inside the Nixon White House.

From this listening post, Ober (at Angleton's direction) provided inside information about Watergate that helped bring down the Nixon administration.

So despite all that you — and the American people — have heard from the major media about Watergate, this information is not something that is in widespread distribution. Suffice it to say, based on what we have discussed here today, I think you understand why.

[Although, in subsequent years, Watergate reporter Robert Woodward has claimed that his source was actually a former FBI official named Mark Felt, there are many — including yours truly — who doubt Woodward's words regarding this matter — MCP]

Now . . . what of Bill Clinton's impeachment affair — the third great political crisis to rock the American system of government during the last quarter of the 20th century?

Where in the world could anyone ever divine an underlying Israeli involvement in that sordid business?

Of course, Bill Clinton's problems were very much of his own making. However, bear in mind that the Israelis and their powerful lobby — in league with pro-Israel forces in the major media — took great advantage of the affair.

As a starting point, note that it was none other than William Kristol who was one of the first individuals to float the Monica Lewinsky story publicly.

Many of you are probably familiar with William Kristol, now a prominent media figure who is perhaps the leading media publicist for the misdeeds of the now-infamous Richard Perle, the leading Arab-hating fanatic advising the Bush administration today.

Not only is young Kristol the front man for media tycoon Rupert Murdoch — a major ally of Israel's hard-line Likud — but Kristol himself is the son of journalist Irving Kristol and historian Gertrude Himmelfarb, major "neoconservative" figures with long-standing close ties to Israel's right wing. Like his parents, Kristol is a "Likudnik" and during the Clinton years he emerged as a prominent and harsh critic of President Clinton's decision — as the hard-line Likudnik's perceived it — to "turn his back" on the state of Israel.

It should not be forgotten, in this context, that on January 26, 1998, just as the Lewinsky affair began escalating and engulfing Clinton, Kristol released a letter to Clinton, pressuring the president to launch a military attack on Israel's hated enemy, Iraq.

Signing the letter along with Kristol were a bevy of other famed American supporters of Israel's "right wing" including notably, Richard Perle, a former deputy secretary of defense and highly-paid consultant for Israeli arms interests who now serves as a top advisor to the Bush administration.

Rupert Murdoch's Fox News Channel carried the story almost non-stop around the clock. Even when other features were telecast, they were subject to interruption for any breaking developments in the Clinton scandal, regardless of how mundane they might be.

One daytime Fox tabloid show even brought in a reported specialist in "body language" to view a videotape of Clinton and Miss Lewinsky meeting in a receiving line after which the so-called specialist declared Clinton was treating the young girl as though she were "the first lady."

And please note also that on the eve of the first major wave of stories linking Clinton to Miss Lewinsky, even prior to his official meeting with President Clinton, the Israeli prime minister, Benjamin Netanyahu, had already met with (and appeared at a pro-Likud rally in the company of) Rev. Jerry Falwell, one of Clinton's most vociferous critics.

Even *The Washington Post* itself revealed on January 22, 1998 that "a senior Netanyahu official had said the Israeli leader was prepared to respond to opposition from the White House by demonstrating his 'own ammunition' in U.S. political circles" — namely Falwell and the boisterous pro-Zionist "Christian right."

In fact, the Lewinsky scandal forced the president into retreat as far as pushing Israel was concerned — much to the delight of Israel's right.

[Some years later, just before his death, Jerry Falwell admitted in an interview with *Vanity Fair* magazine that, in fact, he and Israel's Netanyahu had deliberately orchestrated the aforementioned meeting at precisely that time for the very deliberate purpose of putting pressure on the Clinton administration.

And that was an interesting admission, inasmuch as, later, when the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith and other Jewish lobby forces were denouncing my presentation at the Zayed Center, they suggested that my claims regarding Falwell and Netanyahu were a sordid "conspiracy theory" of anti-Semitic intent — MCP.]

Clinton, of course, survived the impeachment and the Senate trial that followed, but there is no doubt that his ability to pursue any policy that might have stunted Israel's hard-line Likud government had been thoroughly sabotaged.

The Lewinsky scandal — manipulated as it was by the American media — put the Clinton administration on the edge for the rest of its days. And that was very clearly the intent.

So it is: the power of the media not only to influence American perception of the Middle East policy of the United States, but also to influence that policy itself.

It is all part of the secret history of the 20th century.

There is much more than can and should be said.

But I will close with this warning and reminder:

Writing in *Time* on Feb. 17, 2003 Charles Krauthammer, one of the most widely-touted pro-Zionist fanatics in the American media today announced that the proposed war against Iraq "is not just to disarm Saddam. It is to reform a whole part of the world."

"What the U.S. needs in the Arab world," he said, "is not an exit strategy but an entry strategy. Iraq is the beckoning door . . ."

Krauthammer and his like-minded colleagues in the media and in the "neo-conservative" circles surrounding Richard Perle and others who are guiding the Bush administration's Middle East policy are intent upon waging war on the entire Islamic world. Krauthammer frankly names their targets: "Iran, Saudi Arabia, Syria and beyond."

Note those ominous words: "And beyond."

The Prophet Muhammad, I am told, once said that "One learned man is harder on the devil than a thousand ignorant worshipers."

I am here to say that Charles Krauthammer and those of his ilk represent the devil and not until there is a truly free press in America will we be able to turn so many ignorant Americans into learned men.

I thank you again, with all my heart, for this great honor of addressing you here today.

There are indeed many, many Americans who admire the Arab and Muslim peoples and many more who would do so if only they knew the truth that is being kept from them by the major media.

I encourage the people and leaders of the Arab world to extend their hands of friendship and support to those independent-minded journalists and media voices who do dare to speak out. Working together, we can achieve a just and peaceful resolution to the ongoing crisis in the Middle East that threatens to destroy our world.

The Jewish Lobby Roars: Zionist Pressure Results in Shut-Down of the Arab League Think Tank

WHAT FOLLOWS IS AFP correspondent Michael Collins Piper's account of how Zionist pressure resulted in the shut-down of the Arab League's think tank, the Zayed Centre, as a direct response to Piper's address to the centre on the topic of Zionist media power . . .

Not surprisingly, two major units of the pro-Israel propaganda lobby in the United States were quite exercised over the fact that I had been a guest lecturer before a scholarly body in the Arab world — the official think tank of the Arab League, no less.

And as a direct result of Jewish lobby demands on the United States government, the administration of President George W. Bush pressured the government of the United Arab Emirates, the primary sponsor of the Abu Dhabi-based Zayed International Centre for Coordination and Follow-Up, to cease funding and shut down the think tank.

The shutdown of the center came after the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B'nai B'rith and the Middle East Media Research Institute (MEMRI) — founded by a former Israeli intelligence officer — issued blustering reports to the press condemning the center for featuring not only me but other independent voices among their extensive roster of speakers from around the world.

The ADL and MEMRI were particularly concerned about my presence among the speakers.

Named up front as a major "villain" both in the ADL and MEMRI reports was yours truly. The ADL report named me not once, but three consecutive times. (Earlier in the opening pages of this volume, I noted some of the lies and deceptions appearing in the ADL report.)

The fact that even a wealthy Arab state such as the UAE would be forced to buckle to Zionist demands — engineered through the aegis of the U.S. government — was sad and revealing, to say the least.

And in light of what happened, I should again note that while in Abu Dhabi, I was told by the director of the Zayed Center that the U.S. Embassy in Abu Dhabi had called the center to complain about my lecture.

Needless to say, I find it telling that the rulers of the United States — my country — launched a war against Iraq in the name of 'fighting for democracy and freedom,' yet an official of my own nation would dare tell my Arab hosts that they had no right to sponsor a speaker such as I.

This was not only an insult to the intelligence of my hosts, but it was also an affront to my First Amendment right as an American to speak out and exercise a liberty that American authorities are constantly saying is violated by Saddam and other leaders of the Arab world.

Despite all the lip service by the U.S. government to the concept of "freedom," that freedom seems to stop when criticism of Israel or U.S. policy toward Israel is concerned. What hypocrisy.

As long as the Arabs are talking only to each other, the Israelis have no problem with that.

But the moment the Arabs, through forums such as the Zayed Centre, reach out to other peoples, that's when the Israelis really get angry. They cannot stand the thought that anyone anywhere might be exposed to anything other than a pro-Israel point of view.

In fact, the ADL-MEMRI assault on the Zayed Centre was not only part of an ongoing campaign to disrupt the work of the center and to undermine the conservative, pro-American regime of Sheik Zayed, ruler of Abu Dhabi, capital province of the United Arab Emirates, but also part of a much more broad-ranging campaign by "neo-conservative" imperialist-minded elements to destabilize the entire Arab world.

The ADL and MEMRI joined forces to directly tackle Sheik Zayed of Abu Dhabi after a Harvard graduate student in theology raised loud objections to the fact that the sheik — a generous contributor to academic, social and cultural causes throughout the entire world — made a donation to the Harvard Divinity School to endow a chair in Islamic studies.

In campaigning against the donation, which she demanded that Harvard return, the student — who is Jewish — cited alleged "anti-American" and "anti-Semitic" statements made by a variety of speakers who addressed the Zayed Centre, which was named in honor of Sheik Zayed and chaired by his son, Sheik Sultan, who was also deputy prime minister.

The implicit message of the ADL-MEMRI attack on the Zayed Centre and on the Arab world was that criticism of Israel is, by its very nature, "anti-Semitic," and that criticism of Israel or criticism of U.S. favoritism toward Israel (said to be America's "best ally") is somehow "anti-American."

So, you see, the terms "anti-Semitic" and "anti-American" have thus become welded in an Orwellian fashion into one, and those who dare raise questions that offend Israel in some way are automatically deemed dangerous and a potential threat to American interests — perhaps even "supporters of terrorism."

All of this is part and parcel of the New World Order linguistics that have become so central to the rhetoric and discussion in American society today — and it is coming from the Jewish community and those who do its bidding.

Considering this bellicose (and even threatening) behavior on the part of the organized Jewish community, trampling on traditional American freedoms, is it really any surprise that there is, in fact, anti-Semitism, that people are simply getting fed up with never-ending Jewish pressure and Jewish hysterics?

There will come a time of reckoning — of that I'm sure — and the Jews will have only themselves to blame.